

American Sentinel, vol. 1

*ESR*

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1886	3
January 1886	3
"Proposed Union of Church and State" American Sentinel 1, 1.	3
"True Christianity" American Sentinel 1, 1.	6
March 1886	8
"Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law" American Sentinel 1, 3.	8
April 1886	13
"What Do They Want?" American Sentinel 1, 4.	13
May 1886	17
"A Lesson from Ezra" American Sentinel 1, 5.	17
June 1886	21
"What Think Ye of Christ?" American Sentinel 1, 6.	21
"Religion and the Church" American Sentinel 1, 6.	24
July 1886	28
"National Reform Opposed to the Bible" American Sentinel 1, 7.	28
August 1886	34
"Will 'National Reformers' Persecute?" American Sentinel 1, 8.	34
"'National Reformers' the Enemies of American Institutions" American Sentinel 1, 8.	37
October 1886	42
"State Recognition of Christianity" American Sentinel 1, 10.	42
November 1886	48
"A Pernicious Fallacy" American Sentinel 1, 11.	48

# 1886

## January 1886

**“Proposed Union of Church and State” American Sentinel 1, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

Notwithstanding the fact that the so-called a National Reform Association repeatedly disclaims any desire to bring about a union of Church and State, and is profoundly opposed to such a thing, it is not very difficult to show that, although its supporters reject the *name*, the thing itself is that for which there most earnestly striving. This is shown plainly enough by that article of their constitution, which states that the object is to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall place all Christian institutions and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. Men do not seriously work for the enactment of laws which they have no intention of enforcing; therefore we may be sure that when they shall have accomplished their purpose, “Christian institutions and usages” will be enforced by law. Now when we consider that the term “the church” refers not to any single denomination, but to all professed believers in the Christian religion, it is plain that the carrying out of the design of the National Reform Party, will be nothing less than a union of Church and State.*AMS January 1886, page 4.1*

But we are not now obliged to draw conclusions as to the intent of this Association. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and it one of the issues of March, 1884, Rev. J. W. Foster expressed its design in so clear a manner as to leave no room for doubt. The first proposition was that, “according to the Scriptures, Church and State are mutually separate and independent divine institutions.” This proposition, which may mean anything or nothing, was doubtless intended to prepare the mind for the strong statements of follow, just as the infamous Jefferies used to raise the hopes of his victims of the highest pitch before he pronounced upon them an outrageous and cruel sentence. The second proposition is explicit and enough to satisfy the dullest mind,

it is this:-*AMS January 1886, page 4.2*

“According to the Scriptures, *the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church.*” But the learned it writer and the ingenuous party for which he speaks, would not have anyone imagines that this means a union of Church and State. Oh, no! Both are “mutually independent;” Nevertheless the church is to be master, and the State to exist simply “to the interests of the church.” The lion and the lamb are “mutually independent and separate” animals; there can be no equal union between them; but they may lie down together, the lamb taking its position inside the land, the better to serve his lordship’s interest.*AMS January 1886, page 4.3*

This was just the condition of things during the Middle Ages, when the pope had gained supreme control of affairs. There was no more union of Church and State then than there would be now if the *Statesman’s* ideas were carried out. Then the state was allowed to exist solely for the purpose of serving the interests of the church, and when any secular ruler, as in the case of Henry IV, presumed to act in a way to serve the interests of the Government, he was deposed and excommunicated, and all his dominion was placed under interdict, until he submitted. Human nature has not changed a particle since the eleventh century. Let the body of professed Christians once become thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that the State exist solely to serve the interests of the church, and, with the power in their hands, the horrors of the Inquisition will be revived, unless all shall allow the claim.*AMS January 1886, page 4.4*

Again Mr. Foster says: “The true State will have a wise reference to the churches interests, in all her legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings. Public vice and crime, in morality and licentiousness, the wild boar from the forest, at that devours the garden of the Lord, it destroys; and morality, virtue, and good order, the handmaids to religion, it promotes and encourages.” Every Government tends to promote morality; virtue, and good order; it is for this purpose that Government exist, and unless this is done there is no Government, for government means restraint, and Governments exist for the sole purpose of affording equal rights to all, by restraining the outward

manifestation of those passions which would endanger human rights. But this promotion of good order is solely for the sake of good order, and not for the sake of religion. The State promotes virtue and good order, not because they are handmaids of religion, but because without them there will be anarchy and no government. It cannot make men moral, because morality has to do with the heart, and not simply with outward acts, of which alone the State can take cognizance. A man may be vicious at heart, and yet did nothing of which the State can take notice; nay, even his most intimate friends may be ignorant of his in moral tendencies. Religion alone can change a man's heart and make him truly virtuous; and this it can do with the individual, even if there be no State.AMS  
*January 1886, page 4.5*

But Mr. Foster goes further. He says of the true State; "*The expenses of the church in carrying on her public aggressive work, it meets in whole or in passed out of the public treasury.*" It is but just to the *Statesman* to say that it enters a gentle protest to the statement, saying that the National Reform Association "does not hold that the state should contribute *directly* to the financial support of the church." It does, however, indorse the statement that "the church will recognize the good officers of the Christian State; and the true State will formally acknowledged its obligation to serve the church;" and here is an approval of the claim that it is "the duty of the State, as *such*, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, *defend*, and *maintain* the true religion."AMS *January 1886, page 4.6*

Is not this a union of Church and state? If it is not, then such a thing is impossible. Equality is not necessary to a union. An alliance may be formed between superior and inferior as well as between equals. And this is the alliance proposed, and alliances between mistress and servant, in which the church is to act as mistress, and the state as a dutiful and obedient servant. If it is *not* a union of Church and State, it is at any rate a thing most earnestly to be shunned.AMS  
*January 1886, page 5.1*

It may be wondered why we, as Christians, should object to such a union. We object to it simply because we're Christians. We know that such a union is not in accordance with the spirit of Christianity.

The life and practice of our Lord was an example for all Christians. He did not ask the rulers to support him; on the contrary he recognize the right of earthly governors to exact support from him and his followers. He did not desire forced service; he asks not now for anything but willing obedience. He taught his followers that in this world they were to expect tribulation as pilgrims and sojourners, and not that they should exact obedience as kings in their own land; that their time for reigning would come when he himself should come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him. *Matthew 23:31-34*. Therefore when the church proposes, not simply to unite with the state, but to be served by the State, it is departing from the precepts of the Master, and is becoming unchristian. It is for this reason that we oppose such a step. For ourselves, we have no desire to depart from any true Christian institutions and usages; we acknowledge the divine law that enforces them, and hence have no need that they should be enforced by the law of the land; and we deem it neither just nor wise to force those who do not believe in them to conform to them. The injustice must be apparent to all, and to still say that it is a wise policy to force men to act the hypocrite?*AMS January 1886, page 5.2*

The *Statesman* indignantly repels any accusation that its proposed amendment would infringe upon the rights of any one, much lest take them away. From its own standpoint it would not interfere with the rights of any; because when that amendment should be carried, it would at once appear that all of its composers were possessed of no rights,-a distinction without a enough difference to satisfy the minority. A movement whose obvious result would be to deprive even a single individual of his inalienable rights of the life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, should be vigorously opposed by all two men, and most of all by Christians. E. J. W*AMS January 1886, page 5.3*

**“True Christianity” American Sentinel 1, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

If the struggle be between Christianity and infidelity, we take the side of Christianity. If between a Christian and an infidel, we stop and inquire into the cause. If the Christian is endeavoring to deprive

the infidel of his rights, we will ignore his profession and defend the infidel. *True* Christianity robs no one of his rights, but its followers do to others as they would that others should do to them. W.AMS  
*January 1886, page 6.1*

## March 1886

**“Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law” American Sentinel 1, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as “Anarchists,” who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right for exercise authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earth monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law, which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the Creator and the supreme Ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that “the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will” (*Daniel 4:25*), and the statement of the apostle, that “the powers that be are ordained of God” (*Romans 13:1*), together with many other Scripture references to earthly governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist.*AMS March 1886, page 21.1*

Admitting that earthly governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or, in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governments are sent by the Lord “for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well.” *1 Peter 2:13, 14*. Paul says also that the ruler is God’s minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. *Romans 13:4. AMS March 1886, page 21.2*

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what laws earthly rulers are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the



text first referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute *wrath*, need be such laws as God can approve-they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise; for since God's law is *perfect* (*Psalms* 19:7), covering in its range every act and thought (see *Ecclesiastes* 12:13, 14; *Hebrews* 4:12; *Matthew* 5:20-22, 27, 28), even, human law must be embraced with its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:-*AMS March 1886, page 21.3*

"Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And beside it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy, for with regard for such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. These human laws that assess a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in foro conscientia* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin as to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine."-*Blackstone, vol. 1, p. 36.AMS March 1886, page 22.1*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God, it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience

or expediency.*AMS March 1886, page 22.2*

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute wrath? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also divide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:-*AMS March 1886, page 22.3*

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good.” *Romans 13:1-4.AMS March 1886, page 22.4*

The “high powers” do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, some are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for *good*. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” *Acts 2:28.AMS March 1886, page 22.5*

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:-*AMS March 1886, page 22.6*

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his

neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” *Romans 13:8-10.AMS March 1886, page 22.7*

“He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law,” and “love is the fulfilling of the law.” What law?-Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” and, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” See *Matthew 22:36-40*. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue, showing to what law he refers when he says, “He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.” To make this still *more* emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that “love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is *the fulfilling* of the law.” Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor-loves his neighbor as himself-has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly governments are empowered to take notice.*AMS March 1886, page 22.8*

Thus it is seen that Paul’s argument concerning the office of civil government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure anyone except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind.*AMS March 1886, page 22.9*

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from

hating another, nor take any notice of hatred until it culminates in open crime.*AMS March 1886, page 22.10*

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the *act* is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.*AMS March 1886, page 22.11*

We see, then, how imperfect are human governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature-those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor-human governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone.*AMS March 1886, page 22.12*

## April 1886

**“What Do They Want?” American Sentinel 1, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

The second article of the Constitution of the National Reform Association reads, in part as follows: “The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; ... And to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation’s allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”*AMS April 1886, page 27.1*

We must suppose that those words are intended to conceal some ulterior design; for we are morally certain that none of the National Reformers care to see just the condition of things which the above article might, on a casual reading, seem to demand. By a little examination of the subject we can see that the expressed object of the National Reform Party could not be realized unless the religious bodies this country should undergo a great transformation.*AMS April 1886, page 27.2*

Our first question is, What is Christianity? Webster defines it as, “The religion of Christians; the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ.” Then right in connection with this, we must answer the question, What are Christian institutions? The obvious answer is, The ordinances of the Christian religion; instituted by Christ. And as all the professed followers of Christ, professors of the Christian religion, are termed as a body, the church we may say that Christian institutions are ordinances of the Christian church.*AMS April 1886, page 27.3*

When we come to an examination of the subject of Christian ordinances, we shall find that there are very few of them. The apostle Paul describes one of them in *1 Corinthians 11:23-26*: “For I have received of the Lord that which delivered unto you, That the

Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." *AMS April 1886, page 27.4*

One Christian ordinance, then, is the Lord's Supper. It was instituted by Christ, is enjoined upon all his followers, and is peculiar to Christianity. One more: Just as Christ was about to ascend to Heaven, he said to his disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall, be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." *Mark 16:15, 16*. To these two ordinances some Christians add the washing of feet as found in *John 13:1-15*; but all are agreed on the first two. Here, then, we have two, or at the most, three Christian ordinances. They are peculiar to Christianity, and besides them there are no others. *AMS April 1886, page 27.5*

Some one will exclaim, "What about the Golden Rule?" We reply, That is not peculiar to Christianity. Do not misunderstand us. We do not say that the keeping of it is not necessary to Christianity, but that it is not peculiar to Christianity. When our Saviour said, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," he immediately added, "for this is the law and the prophets." The golden rule is simply a summary of the last six precepts of the decalogue; but the decalogue was in existence and of obligation before man fell, and consequently before there was any need of Christianity. The ten commands, which comprise all primary obligation, would have been just as much in force as they are now, even if there had been no fall involving the necessity for a Christian religion; and more than this, they are now, as they were in the beginning, of universal obligation; so that they are equally binding on Jews, Mohammedans, Christians, and pagans. But baptism and the Lord's Supper not only are not obligatory upon Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans, but they are positively denied to such until they profess allegiance to Christ. *AMS April 1886, page 27.6*

We repeat, therefore, that the only possible Christian ordinances are baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the ordinance of humility, or feet-washing. These are the features which outwardly indicate the possession of Christianity. And therefore if a nation is to be really a "Christian nation," these features must exist in it. If it demands that all its subjects submit to these ordinances, then it will be, in name, a Christian nation; but if none of these features exist in it, then it is in no sense a Christian nation.*AMS April 1886, page 27.7*

Has the United States any of these Christian features? Does it require any or all of them as a condition of citizenship? Everybody answers, No. Then it has no "existing Christian features" to be maintained. National Reform zeal, therefore, in that particular, is entirely misapplied.*AMS April 1886, page 27.8*

Now for a brief consideration of the difficulties in the way of making this a "Christian nation," *i.e.*, a nation having Christian features. At the outset we are met with a controversy over baptism. A large and respectable body of Christian professors hold that nothing but immersion is baptism. Many more hold that sprinkling meets the requirement of the Saviour; while still others teach that either immersion, sprinkling, or pouring is baptism. Most immersionists hold that a single immersion is all that can be allowed, while some claim three immersions are necessary to constitute baptism. Here is an irreconcilable controversy; for though the matter has been under discussion for centuries, it is no nearer a settlement than in the beginning. Concerning the Lord's Supper there is almost equal division. A large part of the so-called Christian church withholds the cup from the laity, while many are of late disposed to dispense with the entire ordinance. As for the third ordinance, it is celebrated by but few, the greater part of professed Christians being utterly opposed to it.*AMS April 1886, page 27.9*

But it is useless to carry this point any further, for if you were to put the question, the entire body of "National Reformers" would with one voice declare that they desire no such thing as that the nation shall recognize baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc. And in so saying they would speak the truth. Nevertheless they do declare that this is, or ought to be, a Christian nation, and that "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages," should be placed "on an undeniable legal

basis in the fundamental law of the land;" and we know that that can be done only by making the Constitution require the celebration of baptism and the Lord's Supper as a condition of citizenship. It must be that they have something else in mind, which in their opinion is peculiar to Christianity, and upon which there would not be among professed Christians so much difference of opinion. What do they want, anyway? In a future article we shall let them tell for themselves. E. J. W.*AMS April 1886, page 27.10*



## May 1886

### “A Lesson from Ezra” American Sentinel 1, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

While the so-called “National Reformers” continually deny that their movement has any likeness to a proposed union of Church and State, they do not deny that they want to make such changes in our national Constitution as will place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. It is true that they insert the words “of our Government,” after “usages;” but as our Government has no Christian usages, all understand that the usages of the Christian church are referred to. The design of the National Reform party is, then, to so change the Constitution that Christian usages may enforced by civil law. It is not necessary for us to call it a union of Church and State; will simply remember that the avowed purpose is to make it possible to compel people to follow certain Christian usages, and this by the power of the law of the land.*AMS May 1886, page 35.1*

Since the advocates of this state of affairs are fond of referring to the Bible for precedents for their proposed scheme; and since they imagine that they are following in the footsteps of the ancient worthies; we invite them to a brief consideration of the course which was pursued by one excellent man of old, “a ruler in Israel.”*AMS May 1886, page 35.2*

Ezra was undoubtedly a man of God. He was a man of stern integrity and of the most sincere piety. Moreover, he was a statesman, well versed in the ways of courts, and was also a brave soldier, and a skilled leader of men. When, after a long delay, and much discouragement, the Jews were confirmed in the privileges granted them by Cyrus, king of Persia, Ezra was the one to whom the work of restoring Jerusalem was intrusted. The Jews had been captives in a foreign land, but God had worked upon the hearts of the heathen king, so that they were allowed to return to their own land and re-establish the worship of Jehovah.*AMS May 1886, page 35.3*

With quite a train of followers, Ezra set out for his own country. But the way was long and dangerous, and there were many even of the subjects of the king of Persia, who wished only evil to the Jews and their work. Here was the time, if ever, for Ezra to invoke the aid of the king, and secure a company of soldiers to protect him and his companions. But he did no such thing. After getting his people together, he halted at the river of Ahava (*Ezra 8:15-18*), and sent for the priests of the Lord. As soon as the priest had arrived, Ezra proceeded as follows:-*AMS May 1886, page 35.4*

“Then I proclaimed a fast there, at the river of Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our substance. For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath are against all them that forsake him. So we fasted and besought our God for this; and he was intreated of us.” *Ezra 8:21-23.AMS May 1886, page 35.5*

The result is told in the following words:-*AMS May 1886, page 35.6*

“Then we departed from the river of Ahava, on the twelfth day of the first month, to go unto Jerusalem; and the hand of our God was upon us, and he delivered us from the hand of the enemy, and of such as lay in wait by the way.” *Verse 31.AMS May 1886, page 35.7*

This is our text. The application is plain. Ezra says: “I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him.” Ezra felt that if he should ask the king for protection, it would be virtually a denial of his faith. The Jews had told the heathen of the power of Jehovah, no doubt quoting the words of Moses: “There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.” And now if Ezra should ask kingly protection, the heathen would say, Where is your God? If he is so powerful, why do you not

depend upon him, instead of seeking the protection of an earthly monarch? Such questions would have been well put. Ezra knew it; he knew that to ask for protection from the king would be to proclaim the weakness of Israel.*AMS May 1886, page 35.8*

The same principles will apply to-day. The Christian religion is from God. Christ, its founder, said that he spoke only the words of God. He said also, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." *John 18:36*. If Christians in the nineteenth century, contrary to the precept and example of their leader, appeal to force, they simply proclaim their lack of faith in God. The National Reformers will, it is true, disclaim any design to appeal to force in support of Christianity; but laws are for nothing, if they are not to be enforced. No custom is made legal, unless it is desired to enforce that custom. To "enforce" means to support by force. And therefore when Christian usages are placed on a legal basis in the fundamental law of the land, it is nothing else than an appeal to force of arms, if necessary, to support those usages when they are violated. But such an appeal to force would be a virtual proclamation that God had departed from those making the appeal. It would be a confession of one of two things: Either that the ones making the appeal had no faith in God's power to care for his own cause, or else that the customs in whose support civil authority was invoked, did not have the support of divine authority.*AMS May 1886, page 35.9*

It is just as plain now as it was in the days of Ezra, that religion is lowered in the eyes of the world, when civil power is invoked in its behalf. To place Christian institutions on a legal basis in the law of the land, would be to put them on a level with human institutions. Therefore it is in the interest of religion that we oppose this proposed Constitutional Amendment. As Christians we do not want to see any institution or usage that is really Christian, and which therefore bears the divine impress, sunk to the level of "a police regulation." Christian institutions have the support of God, and therefore do not need the support of the State; and if the institutions which it is proposed to enforce are not really Christian, then certainly should condemn the movement. E. J. W.*AMS May 1886,*



## June 1886

**“What Think Ye of Christ?” American Sentinel 1, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

As we have read the arguments of the so-called National Reformers, in which they claim for Christ a political sovereignty, we have involuntarily asked the above question. We have wondered whether they really regarded Christ as the divine Son of God, or as a scheming politicians. Two quotations will suffice to show that our query is well grounded. In the *Christian Statesman* of April 22, in reply to the statement that “The apostles and primitive Christians never tried to get an amendment inserted in the statutes and laws of the Roman Empire,” M. A. Gault says:*AMS June 1886, page 42.1*

“Christ and his apostles did not work to amend the Roman laws and constitution, because it [Rome] was not a republic. Its power did not come to the people. Its laws were not a reflection of the sentiments of the people, and it could not be made a Christian nation in the sense in which ours can.”*AMS June 1886, page 42.2*

That is as much as to say that if Christ had come in the days when Rome was a republic, he would have set about amending its laws. Instead of going about Judea and Galilee doing good, preaching the gospel to the poor, healing the broken-hearted, and those that were oppressed of the devil, he would have gone to Rome, got himself elected to the Senate, or as consul, and would at once have set about making Rome a Christian nation, by legal enactment! This is the way the “National Reformers” are doing, and they profess to be followers of Christ. The Lord, through the psalmist, said to the wicked, “Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself,” and that statement seems to be applicable in this case. Because they bring religion down to the level of party politics, they imagine that Christ would do the same.*AMS June 1886, page 42.3*

Before commenting any further on the above, we will quote the illustration which a “National Reformer” gave to show what Christ did not accept the office of King when he was on earth. The

illustration is quoted by Rev. Wm. Ballantine, in his reply to Dr. W. Wishart. Said the lecturer:-*AMS June 1886, page 42.4*

“Had General Grant, after taking Richmond, been offered the office of township constable in any locality, he would have repelled the office with disdain. So Christ, being offered the small principality or kingdom of the Jews, refused acceptance; but if he had been offered the kingdoms of the whole world, as Grant the presidency of the United States, like him, Christ would have accepted.”*AMS June 1886, page 43.1*

We cannot conceive how a man calling himself a Christian could use such blasphemous language, except on the ground that he was drunk with the idea of a union of Church and State. The question, “What think ye of Christ?” is indeed a pertinent one to put to the self-styled National Reformers. And the answer to the question, as drawn from their own statements, would be, “A selfish man of the world; a politician seeking the highest office.” In this we do not wish to be understood as implying that General Grant was such a man. There is no point of comparison between General Grant and Jesus Christ. General Grant was a man; Jesus Christ is the Son of God. General Grant, as a man, acted with manly dignity; but if Christ had done the same thing he would have been man and not God. The party of which the *Christian Statesman* is the organ, is wont to brand every one who opposes it as an atheist; but the above quotations show that the effect of inviting National Reform principles is to give one low views of Christ in his work. We never heard an infidel express sentiments more derogatory to the character of Christ. Being Christians ourselves and adoring Christ as the divine Mediator between God and man, we oppose the work of the National Reform Party because it is unchristian in its tendency.*AMS June 1886, page 43.2*

To go back to Mr. Gault’s assumption that Christ would have attempted to amend the laws of Rome if it had been a republic. Says he, “Its laws were not a reflection of the sentiments of the people; and it could not be made a Christian nation in the sense in which ours can.” No, of course not; there would have been just the difference between an empire and a republic. The laws of Rome reflected the sentiments of the emperor, and the people acquiesced

in them just the same as the people in a republic do in laws made by their representatives. The emperor was to them a divine being, an object of adoration, and therefore his laws did reflect the sentiments of the people. Therefore if Christ had been such a one as he is described by the Religious Amendmentists, he would have gone to Rome and converted the emperor. The emperor, being converted, would at once have placed "all Christian usages, institutions, and laws" on an undeniable legal basis, and, *presto*, Rome would have been a "Christian nation." And since "the empire of Rome filled the world," by that act the whole world would have been "Christianized." *AMS June 1886, page 43.3*

But, hold; that very thing was done. Not by Christ, however, but a little less than three hundred years after he declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Constantine the Great is generally known as "the first Christian emperor." He made laws in favor of Christians, and although he was not baptized till near his death, he fully identified himself with the professed Christian party. In his day the whole Roman Empire became "Christianized." At that time there existed just the state of things which the Religious Amendment Party is now striving to bring about. As an evidence of this, and to show how thoroughly "National Reform" principles were carried out the church historian, Socrates, tells us that no one was allowed to possess any Arian document, under pain of being burned at the stake, together with the prescribed document. And so strictly was this edict of that "Christian" emperor carried out, that not a line of the writings of Arius is in existence. *AMS June 1886, page 43.4*

Like causes produce like effects. As the result of the "Christianization" of the State by legal enactments in Constantine's time, bishoprics were bought and sold just the same as secular offices were then and are now. The richest and most influential men secured the office of bishop, and used that office to increase their wealth and influence. Since religion was regulated by the civil law, the emperor was the natural head of the church; and since He also was the dispenser of patronage, men professed Christianity in order to secure office. The emperor continued to be head of the church until he transferred that dignity to the powerful bishop of Rome, whose assistance he needed in civil matters. Religion was then a matter of policy. And that is just what would happen in this country if

religion were upheld by legal enactment. We care not how pure the motives of some of the advocates of the Religious Amendment may be; when the proposed Amendment is adopted, the results briefly indicated above will follow just as surely as the night follows the day. And that is the state of things which these men in their blindness imagine that Christ would sanction!*AMS June 1886, page 43.5*

And this naturally brings us to another thought that was suggested by the second quotation, which says that if Jesus had been offered the kingdoms of the whole world he would have accepted. We call to mind the fact, recorded in two of the Gospels, that Jesus was once offered “all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.” Did he accept? Not even in thought. Why not? Because the condition was that he should fall down and worship Satan. That same offer is still held out to the church. Many are becoming dazzled by the sight, and many, led by a selfish zeal which they suppose is zeal for Christ, are eager to accept. But the conditions have never changed, and if at any time before the nations are given to Christ to be dashed in pieces, his professed followers accept; professedly in his name, and for him, the sovereignty of any or all of the kingdoms of this world, it may be set down as a fact that it is because they have accepted the conditions which Christ rejected with holy scorn.*AMS June 1886, page 43.6*

If those who are so loudly clamoring for Christ to be recognized as the head of this Government, would study his life and get proper ideas of his exalted character and of the nature of his kingdom, they might truly honor him. As it is, their work tends only to degrade Christianity into dishonor Christ. Christ not only did not seek; but he resolutely shunned political alliance, and “he that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even has he walked.” E. J. W.*AMS June 1886, page 43.7*

**“Religion and the Church” American Sentinel 1, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

When so much is said *pro* and *con* about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by “the



church.” Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodists, Baptists, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If in speaking of “the church” we should refer to some special denomination, we would thereby imply that no other denomination could be part of “the church.” With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term “the church” with reference to any particular sect.*AMS June 1886, page 45.1*

In the Bible “the church” is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that “he is the head of the body, the church” (*Colossians 1:18*); and again he says that God “hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.” *Ephesians 1:22, 23*. Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the church, as Paul says, “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,” and that this body is Christ is shown by the words, “As many of you as had been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.”*AMS June 1886, page 45.2*

“The church,” then, in the strict sense of the word, is comprised of those who are “in Christ,” who have been converted, “born again,” and are consequently “new creatures.” From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them all together, can be called “the church.” Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of “the church,” because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian.*AMS June 1886, page 45.3*

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the church is known only to Him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither, is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of this church. Thus we *assume*, since we cannot *decide*, that each individual’s profession is an honest one.*AMS June 1886, page 45.4*

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the church. It is that

which makes the church, and without that there is no church.*AMS June 1886, page 45.5*

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether or not the Religious Amendment Party is in favor of a union of Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the National Convention held in New York in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Peoria, Ill., said:-*AMS June 1886, page 45.6*

“It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant, or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all the other sects; or that all these sects would combine to affect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate it on principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. This is a good thing-and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions.”*AMS June 1886, page 45.7*

*AMS June 1886, page 46.1*

“But,” says one, “do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?” We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any man religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State.*AMS June 1886, page 46.2*

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true

religion marks one as a real Christian-a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so likewise the profession of religion by the State, constitutes a State church. It is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And when such a union shall have been affected, what will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment Party is pledged to bring about.*AMS June 1886, page 46.3*

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding? E. J. W.*AMS June 1886, page 46.4*

## July 1886

**“National Reform Opposed to the Bible” American Sentinel 1, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

When we use the term “National Reform,” it is understood that we refer to the theories advanced by the Party which is endeavoring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A true reform could not, of course, be opposed to the Bible; but the so-called “National Reform” movement is in no sense a reform, and that because it is opposed to the Bible. We use the term because it has been assumed by the Party, and not because we regard the movement as a reform.*AMS July 1886, page 51.1*

A great point which the leaders of that Party aim to make is that Jesus is now the literal ruler and Governor of nations; that, for instance, the President of the United States is only the nominal head of this Government, but that Jesus Christ is the real head-the king-and that therefore his sovereignty should be formally acknowledged. If they were not infatuated they could certainly see the absurdity of speaking of the king of the republic, even if they could not see how antagonistic their position is to the truth of the Bible. We believe, however, that those who have not become intoxicated with the wine of National Reform error, can readily see the following points:-*AMS July 1886, page 51.2*

When God had created the earth, he said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.” *Genesis 1:26-28.AMS July 1886, page 51.3*

In this work of creation the Son was associated with the Father, and

was the active agent for by him the worlds were made (*Hebrews 1:2*) and John says, "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." *John 1:3*. Therefore it was the Son, as well as the Father, who gave the dominion of the earth to man.*AMS July 1886, page 51.4*

With the narrative in Genesis agree the following words of the psalmist: "The Heaven even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath he given to the children of men." *Psalms 115:16*. From these two texts nothing can be plainer than that the dominion of this world has been entrusted to men.*AMS July 1886, page 51.5*

Let no one imagined that we would intimate that God has nothing to do with this earth. We do not so believe, and the texts that we have quoted do not so teach. The greater includes the less, and the statement that the heavens are the Lord's, is equivalent to saying that God rules over all, as is stated in *Psalms 103:19*: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Therefore "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." *Psalms 24:1*. But, while these texts recognize God's right to all things, as Creator, they do not conflict with the statement, "the earth hath he given to the children of men."*AMS July 1886, page 51.6*

For what purpose has he given it to the children of men? That they may govern it, even as stated in *Genesis 1:26, 27*. This is shown in *Romans 13:1-4*, where it is stated that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that rulers are appointed to bear the sword of justice. The expression, "the powers that be are ordained of God," refers to authority in general, rather than to particular Governments. And this should be sufficient to show that, although God rules the entire universe, he is not the head of any earthly Government. If he were, then there would be but one correct form of Government, and the officers of that Government would be appointed directly by Him, as in the case of the ancient Jewish Government. But no one can claim that of the various nations of earth, one is ordained of God, to the exclusion of the others.*AMS July 1886, page 51.7*

Take for instance, Russia, Germany, England, and the United States. Here we have four Governments, all differing in their

structure. Which of them is ordained of God? All of them. They are all for the purpose of preserving order, and of guarding the rights of each individual against the encroachments of others. This is all that earthly Governments are ordained to do. The whole of the law against the violation of which they can execute wrath is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and this they can enforce only so far as concerns outward acts. They cannot compel a man to love his neighbor in his heart, but they can see that he does his neighbor no personal wrong, and when they do this, they are carrying out that for which they were appointed. And in thus executing justice between man and man the ruler is ordained of God, whether he is born to the throne, or whether he is elected by the people, or appointed by a few. The Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Germany, the Queen of England, and the President of the United States, are all equally ordained of God as ministers of justice; not because God is personally at the head of any one of these Governments, but because he has ordained that man shall be under authority, and the individuals above referred to are in authority in their respective Governments. In the discharge of their duty, they are each personally responsible to God, just the same as the humblest peasant.*AMS July 1886, page 51.8*

But, although man was given dominion over the earth and all that it contains, all things are not now under him. Adam was overcome by the tempter, and so forfeited his dominion. He has not now perfect dominion over the earth, because it does not yield to him the increase that it formerly did; and the beast of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea are not passively subject to his control. What man forfeited, he has no power to regain. And so, since we do not now see all things put under him, Paul says that "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." *Hebrews 2:9*. Not only did Christ taste death in order to restore to man his forfeited life, but he also bore the curse of the earth (compared *Genesis 3:17, 18* and *Matthew 27:29*), that He might redeem it, and restore to man the possession that he lost.*AMS July 1886, page 51.9*

Since Christ alone could redeem the lost dominion, and has paid the price, it is to him that it is to come. Says the prophet, "And thou,

O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it *come*, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem.” *Micah 4:8*. And so Paul directs the minds of the disciples forward to the time of “the redemption of the purchased possession.” *Ephesians 1:14*. And when that time shall come, and the kingdom shall be given to Him “whose right it is,” those who have suffered with Christ shall also reign with him. *2 Timothy 2:12; Romans 8:17*. *AMS July 1886, page 52.1*

But it is not within the power of men to restore the kingdom to Christ. Here is where the would-be National Reformers make their fatal blunder. They say, “We must gain the world for Christ, and place him in his rightful position as Sovereign.” But God says to the Son, “Ask of *me*, and *I* shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.” *Psalms 2:8*. When some of the people “thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear,” Christ told them that he was as one going into a far country “to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.” *Luke 19:11, 12*. And Daniel, in the prophetic vision, saw the giving of the kingdom to Christ by the Father, and has described it in the following language: “I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” *Daniel 7:13, 14*. *AMS July 1886, page 52.2*

Add to the above the following prophetic account of the time and circumstances of the giving of the kingdoms of this world to Christ, and the utter folly of the claims of the Amendmentists will be apparent:—*AMS July 1886, page 52.3*

“And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art

to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth.” *Revelation 11:15-19.AMS July 1886, page 52.4*

Here we see that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, only when the time comes that the dead shall be judged, and when the corrupt of earth shall be destroyed. Compare *Psalms 2:8, 9* and *Revelation 19:11-21.AMS July 1886, page 52.5*

In this brief survey we have learned concerning Christ's sovereignty, (1) That He is not now ruler of this world; the dominion given to man in the beginning, has been forfeited, and Satan having usurped the authority is “God of this world.” (2) Man has no power to recover the lost dominion; Christ alone has the power, and he has paid the price. The controversy therefore, is between Christ and Satan. (3) We are now only waiting “the redemption of the purchased possession,” when the kingdoms of this world shall be given to Christ, and he will reign forever as actual sovereign of this world. (4) He has now gone to receive the kingdom, and to return. (5) The Father has promised “the uttermost parts of the earth” to Christ for a possession, and he alone has power to bestow the gift. (6) Men do not win the kingdom to Christ and then place him on the throne, but on the contrary, when Christ comes on the throne of his glory, having received the kingdom, he will call the righteous to come and share it with him. *Matthew 25:31-34*. And (7) this will be only at the end of the world, when the dead shall be judged, and the wicked destroyed.*AMS July 1886, page 52.6*

It has been before shown that the so-called National Reform theory is absurd; we think this shows that it is unscriptural. That is the reason for its absurdity, for whatever is unscriptural must be absurd. When we consider God's great plan of salvation, and the infinite price that has been paid for the redemption of the earth, and of man, that he may be assisted to a place in the kingdom of God, it seems little less than blasphemous presumption for the puny



creatures to arrogate to themselves the task of placing the Creator  
on his own throne! E. J. W.*AMS July 1886, page 52.7*

## August 1886

**“Will ‘National Reformers’ Persecute?” American Sentinel 1, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the “National Reform” convention held in Pittsburgh, in February, 1874, Dr. A. A. Hodge made a speech in favor of the proposed amendment, in the course of which he uttered the following words:-*AMS August 1886, page 59.1*

“If the Christian majority prevail and maintain Christian institutions, the infidel minority will be just where they have always been, and the exact position in which they voluntarily accepted citizenship; and while they may be restrained from some self-indulgence, they can be constrained as to violation of their convictions.”*AMS August 1886, page 59.2*

“On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose their precious heritage from their fathers, which they held in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences.”*AMS August 1886, page 59.3*

From this deliverance we draw the following necessary conclusions:-*AMS August 1886, page 59.4*

The idea intended to be conveyed is that “we,” the “National Reformers,” are all good; “we,” would not persecute anybody; but if the unbelieving minority should prevail, “we,” the innocent and helpless majority, would be at their mercy. As a piece of sentimental cant, the utterance was a success; to common sense and truth, it was a failure, for minorities have never yet persecuted majorities, and the very idea of such a thing is absurd. No matter how violent a man may be, the man who has twice the power that he has is in no danger. What Dr. Hodge calls the “unbelieving minority,” now occupies, according to the “National Reformers,” the very ground for which they are striving. The “Reformers” claim that they want to Christianize this Government, then it must be that this “unbelieving

minority” now holds the ground, and yet we have not heard of any persecution being raised against the “Christian majority.” As a matter of fact, no people have ever suffered persecution for consciences’ sake, except from the hands of those who professed some form of religion.*AMS August 1886, page 59.5*

These “National Reformers” do not agree among themselves. Dr. Hodge says that: If their project carries, infidels will be just where they have always been. But Mr. Coleman says that the essence of their movement will “*disfranchise* every logical conscientious infidel.” We believe Mr. Coleman’s statement because (1) from the very nature of the case the “Reformers,” if successful, must disfranchise those who dissent from their position, and because (2) Dr. Hodge’s very statement provides not only for the persecution of those Christians who may disagree with the majority. Notice carefully the following:-*AMS August 1886, page 59.6*

“On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose their precious heritage from their fathers, which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law man, and take the consequences.”*AMS August 1886, page 59.7*

With the last clause we agree. Where there is a conflict between the law of God and the law of man, the law of God must have a preference. “But,” say the “National Reformers,” “we propose to make the law of God the law of the land, and then there can be no persecution, because a law of men will coincide with that of God. “The fallacy in this proposition lies in the assumption that they, if successful, will make the perfect law of God the law of the land, or that, if they should do so, all who revere God’s law would agree with their understanding of it. They count on there being no dissenters except infidels, forgetting or ignoring the fact that there are conscientious differences of opinions even among Christians.*AMS August 1886, page 59.8*

It is a fact that among professed Christians there is not perfect unanimity of opinion concerning the law of God. On this point the Christian world may be divided into the following classes:-*AMS*

*August 1886, page 59.9*

1. Those who hold that the law of God is binding upon all men.*AMS August 1886, page 59.10*

2. Those who hold that the law was abolished at the cross, and that it now has no claim upon anybody. The first class may be still further divided as follows:-*AMS August 1886, page 59.11*

1. Those who hold that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday.*AMS August 1886, page 59.12*

2. Those who believe that the fourth commandment now enjoins the observance of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.*AMS August 1886, page 59.13*

As all of those who reject the authority of God's law are agreed that Sunday is the proper rest day for mankind, it follows that the only practical controversy over the law of God is concerning the application of the fourth commandment; the great majority of professed Christians including the National Reformers, construe it as enjoining the Sunday rest, while a small minority are positive in their conscientious conviction that it requires them to keep Saturday. Now even allowing that the majority are actually right, and that their interpretation of the law of God is correct, the fact remains that a minority do not admit their interpretation. Those in the minority are conscientious in their belief that the laws which the majority sustain is opposed to the law of God, and when the law of man conflicts with the law of God, Christians have no alternative but to obey the latter, and disobey the former, they must follow their convictions, and, as Dr. Hodge says, "take the consequences." That these "consequences" would be punishment for violating the law of the land, is a necessary and obvious conclusion. Dr. Hodge says in the same speech from which we have quoted:-*AMS August 1886, page 59.14*

"The Christian minister receives the word of God as the law of the church, and interprets it for himself! The Christian magistrate receives the same word as his rule in the State, so far as it casts light upon human duties and relations involved in the function of

government; and the magistrate interprets it for himself.”*AMS August 1886, page 59.15*

*AMS August 1886, page 59.16*

**“‘National Reformers’ the Enemies of American Institutions” American Sentinel 1, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

The readers of the Sentinel must know that in its opposition to the so-called National Reform Movement it is actuated by no personal feelings whatever. Although frequent reference is made to the men and papers that are working for the amendment, it is not done with the design of impugning their motives or calling special attention to them, but because the only way we can show the errors of the National Reform movement is by quoting what its supporters say for it. We believe that many if not all of the leaders in the movement are honest in their motives but they have become blinded by a selfish ambition which they mistake for religious zeal. To show that the movement is directly contrary to the spirit of the golden rule, we quote from an article by Rev. J. J. Carrell, entitled “The Civil Sabbath,” in the *Christian Nation* of June 9. He says:-*AMS August 1886, page 68.1*

“Those who have come from afar, and find life a burden here, knew the character of our institutions before they came. If they have helped to develop our resources and fight our battles, we are not slow to recognize the full value of those services. We accord to them the full rights of citizenship, and all the blessings of preserved nationality, the common reward of all alike. But we decline to accept the doctrine that those services confer upon them the privilege of bringing upon our beloved land a worse scourge and destruction than those averted by the civil war. If any of our citizens find our institutions intolerable, our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear, our attempts to secure sobriety, quietness, and decency, too great a burden for their freedom-loving souls, there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are three thousand miles broad, and are shut neither by day nor by night. If these oppressed and over-burdened souls wish to seek a better country

under the sun, the way is open, and not a tongue will ever wag dissent.”*AMS August 1886, page 68.2*

We wish it to be distinctly understood that we would be second to none in upholding “American institutions” against any attempt on the part of “those who have come from afar,” to overthrow them. With anarchy and Anarchists we have no sympathy. When men combine to overthrow the laws that protect the rights of men we would oppose them in every lawful way. But we have no more objection to this kind of work when done by “those who come from afar” than when done by those born in the land. Now let us notice the inconsistency and the selfishness and disregard of the rights of others, that is manifested in the above paragraph.*AMS August 1886, page 68.3*

The writer says that foreigners who do not choose to conform to our customs and usages should leave; and the keeping of Sunday presumably on the authority of the fourth commandment, is regarded as one of those usages. If men do not want to keep Sunday according to the strict law of Pennsylvania, they have no business here. Now we would like to know how the Amendmentists can harmonize such a position with the position which they take on the Chinese question. The Chinese are heathen; they do not acknowledge God, but bow down to the most disgusting idols, thus breaking the first and second commandment; they know and care nothing about Jesus Christ; like all heathen, they think it no wrong to defraud or steal, if they are not detected; and they pay not the slightest regard to Sunday, and know no rest-day but their New Year Holiday. Many American citizens are endeavoring to have these Chinese driven from our country, and have succeeded in securing laws prohibiting their further immigration. But the Amendmentists utterly condemn all such proceedings. They claim that such a course is unjust. Now we ask how they can harmonize their wish to drive off the man who objects to their strict Sunday laws, with their objections to driving off the Chinaman who not only disregards Sunday, but who openly and repulsively violates all the commandments? The application of the National Reform principles today, or ten years from today, would make it necessary to press every ocean steamer into the service of carrying Chinamen back to their native land. It would exclude the Chinese from this country as

effectually as would the wildest scheme ever advocated by Kearney or O'Donnell. So we say that National reformers are inconsistent.*AMS August 1886, page 68.4*

Now as to their selfishness. This country was settled by those who came here that they might worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, free from oppression for opinion's sake. The principle of religious freedom is the principle on which this Government was founded. It is the first and best of our "American institutions." Now the error of the National Reformers is in regarding the particular beliefs and practices of the pilgrim fathers as American institutions, which must be upheld all hazards, forgetting that the principle of liberty, both civil and religious, is the only distinctive American institution. They say, "Our fathers, who settled this country, venerated the 'Christian Sabbath'; they have bequeathed it to us as an American institution; and if we would not be false to their memory we must see that the Sunday is kept by all men, and kept as they kept it." But in that very resolution they are false to the memory of our fathers who bequeathed to us the principles of liberty which we possess. True loyalty to American institutions would be to say, "Here are some who do not hold as we do on some points of religious faith and practice; now we will not only allow them to hold and carry out their ideas, but will protect them in so doing, just as we ourselves would like to be protected in our opinions." This would not only be in accordance with American institutions, but it would be in harmony with the golden rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them."*AMS August 1886, page 68.5*

Of course it is always understood that in guaranteeing all men liberty of thought and action, the Government stipulates that no one shall disturb others in the exercise of their rights. Nothing less than this would be liberty to all. But the further error of the National Reformers is in supposing that all who differ with them are infringing on their rights. Mr. McCarrell of Pennsylvania, together with enough Pennsylvanians to make a strict Sunday law, imagine that because they want to keep Sunday strictly everybody else must do the same. It may be that their neighbor does not believe that Sunday ought to be observed; he may be a strict and conscientious observer of Saturday; but that makes no difference; "we are *the*

people, and you must do as we do; if you don't like our ways, you may go somewhere else." And this they call upholding American liberty? Surely, American history has been written to no purpose, so far as National Reformers are concerned.*AMS August 1886, page 68.6*

*AMS August 1886, page 69.1*

If we happen to differ with the National Reformers, they certainly differ with us to the same extent; then why should we leave the country any more than they? This is our country as much as it is theirs. We will not attempt to characterize the proposal of Mr. McCarrell as it deserves, but will simply quote a few words from the speech of Mr. Blaine in regard to a similar proposal by Lord Salisbury concerning the Irish: "Lord Salisbury gives the remedy. He says, if the Irish do not want to be governed by the British they should leave. But the Irish have been in Ireland quite as long as Lord Salisbury's ancestors have been in England... Therefore we have to say that Lord Salisbury may be called impudent. We would not transgress courtesy if we called him insolent. We would not transgress truth if we called him brutal." We can only add, We would not be uncharitable if we substituted "the National Reformers" for "Lord Salisbury," and applied Mr. Blaine's language to them.*AMS August 1886, page 69.2*

Now we claim that these conscientious observers of the seventh day, have the same right to protection that the strict observers of Sunday have. The "American institution" of equal liberty for all, grants each party the right to worship on the day which they regard holy, and forbids either party to interfere with the worship of the other. It also guarantees to the non-religious the privilege of observing no day at all, but forbids him to disturb those who conscientiously rest.*AMS August 1886, page 69.3*

We submit to any candid, unprejudice person that the liberty that is guaranteed by our Constitution as it now stands, is all that can be asked by any consistent follower of the golden rule; and that they who ask for a religious amendment to the Constitution, are seeking to overthrow the only distinctive institution which America has; and if all who are seeking to overthrow American institutions should be



banished, the National Reformers should be the first to go. E. J.  
W.AMS *August 1886, page 69.4*

## October 1886

**“State Recognition of Christianity” American Sentinel 1, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

The advocates of the so-called “National Reform” claim that we do them in justice by asserting that they are working for a union of Church and State, and that if their movement shall succeed they will persecute people for conscience sake. They say that we either misunderstand the principles of “National Reform” or else we willfully misrepresent them. We claim that we do neither. We get our ideas of the “National Reform” movement from its official organs, and give the people the utterances of its advocates just as we find them publish. True, they deny that they are working for a union of Church and State, and we publish their denial; but unfortunately for them their arguments go to show that Church and State union is the real object of their ambition.*AMS October 1886, page 76.1*

In the *Christian Nation* for July 7 and 14, 1886, we find an article bearing the same title as the one at the head of this article. It is by the late Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and is edited from the original manuscript by the Rev. R. M. Sommerville, New York. The *Christian nation* is devoted to the interests of the “National Reform” movement, and was endorsed by the Annual Convention of the National Reform Association, Pittsburg, Pa., April, 1885; consequently what ever we find in it may be regarded as official.*AMS October 1886, page 76.2*

The article in question starts out with the statement that the Bible is a revelation from God: that it will make wise and the salvation all who receive it; that no one can know by intuition what the Scriptures teach, but that they must be searched, and that the obligation to search the Scriptures rests upon all men. To these propositions we give a most hearty assent. We also agree with Mr. Sommerville that there are “great difficulties to be encountered in the study of the divine word,” and that for these difficulties the word itself is not responsible, but that they arise from education, from the current of public sentiment, from its bearing on our worldly interests and prospects, and from a determination to find in it what it was never

intended to teach. We also believe that “the great difficulty, and that from which all others derive their existence or their force, is the depravity of the human heart, and our natural enmity to God. There is the reluctance to submit the judgment, the every thought, to the teachings of the spirit. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because there spiritually discerned.”*AMS October 1886, page 76.3*

These propositions are sound, but the conclusion which Mr. Sommerville presumes to draw from them is unsound to the same degree. He says:-*AMS October 1886, page 76.4*

“This consideration suggests the imperative obligation to place men who have the spirit at the political health. Those who are expected correctly to apply the word of the Spirit are such as have the Spirit. The seventy elders who are called to assist Moses in the Government of Israel, are made partakers of the Spirit of the Lord, by whose directions they are brought forward. When Moses made asks successor, he is directed to take Joshua, a man in whom was the Spirit, and to lay his hands upon him and to set him before all the people. Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom. The recognized minister of God must, all cases, be one who has the Spirit of God.”*AMS October 1886, page 76.5*

Let us be sure that we do not misunderstand this matter. It is imperatively necessary that only men who have the Spirit should be placed at the political helm. If this were carried out, it would involve the striking out of the last clause of Article Six of the United States Constitution, which reads, “No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” Now since religion and the church are inseparable; it follows that what Mr. Sommerville considers as “imperative obligation” is nothing less than the union of Church and State.*AMS October 1886, page 76.6*

Indeed, the latter part of the paragraph which we have quoted would indicate so close a union of Church and State that they will

be identical. He would have the civil rulers correspond to the seventy leaders appointed to assist Moses in the government of Israel. But the Government of Israel was a theocracy, and in a theocracy the Government is the church. Among the Jews there were not two distinct organizations, the Church and the State, but every circumcised Jew was a member of the church, and circumcision was the badge of nationality. What Mr. Sommerville here implies, other national reformers openly assert, namely, that this Government ought to be modeled after the Jewish Government, and that this will be the case when their movement succeeds. Mr. Sommerville says, "Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men of 'honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.'" Remember that he is not giving a homily on the Christian church, but is writing about recognition of Christianity; and if the sentence which we have just quoted has anything to do with his subject, it means that the civil rulers of the United States should be regarded simply as ministers to take charge of the temporal affairs of the church. And this agrees exactly with what Mr. Foster says in a *Statesman* March, 1884: "The State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church. If this does not imply union of Church and State we would like to have the National Reformers tell us what in their estimation would constitute such a union." *AMS October 1886, page 76.7*

We would not be understood as implying that there was anything wrong in the Government of Israel. That form of government was instituted by the Lord himself. He chose the Jews as his peculiar people, and constituted himself their sole ruler. The men who were directly over the people were not chosen by the people but were appointed by the Lord, and they received directly from the mouth of the Lord instruction as to how the people should be governed. But none of these things can be paralleled in the United States, even though the National Reformers succeed in changing the Constitution to suit their own ideas; for the Lord has nowhere stated that he has chosen the people of the United States as his own peculiar people. On the contrary, we are told that he is "no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Moreover the National Reformers themselves do not claim that in the proposed new order of government God will himself appoint the rulers, for

they expect that the rulers will be elected by the people, just as they are now. And they certainly are not so wild as to suppose that the rulers whom they may elect will be in personal connection with Heaven. Therefore while their proposed amendment will indeed be a union of Church and State, the union will not have the sanction of God, but will be an unlawful union. It will be in his sight adultery. By that unlawful union the church will be in the condition described in *Revelation 18:1-3*.AMS October 1886, page 76.8

But Mr. Sommerville continues:-AMS October 1886, page 77.1

“Civil rulers, then, are not sent to Rome or to Geneva, to Canterbury or Edinburgh, for information whether an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship, and laws, is to be accepted; but, with all confidence, to the Word. There is no more difficulty pressing on the magistrate than on any other individual in determining what is to be his course, that he may honor the Sovereign at the head of his body, the church.”AMS October 1886, page 77.2

This is in perfect accord with his idea that the State and the Church are to be identical, for he would have “an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship and laws” accepted by the civil rulers. True he says that the rulers should go to the Bible to determine the proper creed, for of worship, and laws of the church that should be accepted by them, and says that the magistrate should have no more difficulty in determining his course in such a matter than any other individual; but when we consider how differences of opinion there are on these points, even among those who profess to be led by the Spirit, we can see only one way in which a magistrate could solve the problem with ease, and that would be to accept and uphold the creed, form of worship, and laws of that association which elected him to his position.AMS October 1886, page 77.3

Sommerville proceeds: “Knowing then, the church, what is his [the magistrate’s] duty respecting it?” and answers his question as follows:-AMS October 1886, page 77.4

It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances and its laws. It is not merely that the

existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the Nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its Constitution and object.”*AMS October 1886, page 77.5*

The answer is plain enough even if it is not grammatically expressed. Civil rulers are to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. This recognition, moreover, is not simply an acknowledgement of the church’s existence, but is to take the form of a statutory arrangement to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church “in conformity with its Constitution and object.” The meaning of this is made still more clear by the wirer. He says further in the same article:-*AMS October 1886, page 77.6*

“Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and to stimulate the church in its work of faith and labor of love, and, when it may be necessary, to give pecuniary aid to its ministers, that the gospel may be preached in every part of their dominions, and to all classes without respect of persons.”*AMS October 1886, page 77.7*

And then he adds:-*AMS October 1886, page 77.8*

“But shall we take-is it right to take-public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed? Most certainly. The gospel from its very nature is aggressive, contemplates the rectification of corrupt, disorderly, and degraded human nature, casts down every high thing that would exalt itself against the knowledge of God, and brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.”*AMS October 1886, page 77.9*

The latter part of this last paragraph is eminently true. The gospel is indeed designed to purify corrupted, disorderly, and degraded human nature, and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And the church is the channel through which the design of the gospel is to be effected. But Mr. Sommerville says, as quoted above, that it is the duty of civil rulers to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church in conformity with its

Constitution and object; which is equivalent to saying that it is the duty of the State to compel men to accept the gospel. In other words, what the church ought to do by persuasion, Mr. Sommerville would have the State do by force.*AMS October 1886, page 77.10*

Note carefully the first part of the paragraph last quoted. Mr. Sommerville says that it is most certainly right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed. This can mean nothing less than that according to National Reform principles it is right to compel people to accept customs to which they are conscientiously opposed, and to make them contribute the means for this purpose. For he does not say simply, that it is right to take public money to *teach* principles to which many members of the community may be conscientiously opposed; that might be endured; but he says that the State may enforce church laws and customs, in opposition to the conscientious convictions of some of the citizens, provided, of course, it is only the minority that are thus opposed. But in any government the laws are enforced not upon one class of citizens but upon all; the law knows no difference in persons. Therefore we are justified in concluding that if Mr. Sommerville and the *Christian Nation* are competent exponents of National Reform doctrine, that doctrine contemplates nothing less than the *compelling* of every individual in the United States to conform to one certain set of religious laws, customs, and usages. This cannot be endured by freemen.*AMS October 1886, page 77.11*

If in this article we have in any way misrepresented “National Reform” we shall esteem it a favor if some of its devotees will tell us wherein. If we have not, then it is as clear as the noonday sun that “National Reform” means a union of Church and State. National Reformers cannot deny this conclusion without recalling their indorsement of the *Christian Nation*. E. J. W.*AMS October 1886, page 77.12*

## November 1886

**“A Pernicious Fallacy” American Sentinel 1, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

VOX POPULI, VOX DEI.-“The voice of the people is the voice of God,”-is a very popular saying. This might be expected from the very nature of the case; for anything which tends to give the people a good opinion of themselves is sure to be popular. At the same time, no saying was ever invented that was farther from the truth. It is one of the most dangerous of Satan’s lies. Its effect is to lead people to ignore the plain commandments of God, which are revealed in His Word, and to put themselves in the place of God. It is taken for granted that what “the people” say and do must be right, even though there may be a command of God to the contrary. And thus this mischievous saying leads “the people” to exalt themselves above God, by making them think that by their united action they can change the decrees of God.*AMS November 1886, page 82.1*

Men ought to be able to learn something from history; if they do not, history is written in vain. The lessons which we learn from the history of the past are equivalent to lessons concerning the future, for, “The thing that hath been,” said Solomon, “it is that which shall be; end that which is done is that which shall be done.” This is true because human nature is the same among all people, and in all ages. Let us recall a few of the things that have been.*AMS November 1886, page 82.2*

Within a thousand years after the creation, God saw that “the people” had corrupted their way on the earth, and so nearly universal was the downward tendency, that only one man was found who followed the expressed commandment of the Lord. Yet, although the people were so nearly unanimous in their choice of evil, it did not cease to be evil, neither did they change the mind of God. Every man who followed the way that was “right in his own eyes” was destroyed by the flood.*AMS November 1886, page 82.3*

It was “the people” who, shortly after the flood, thought to make a name for themselves by building a city and a tower whose top



should reach to heaven; but God frustrated their plan to exalt themselves above Him, and their city was destroyed and they were scattered.*AMS November 1886, page 83.1*

Coming down to later times, we find that when God would have a people for Himself, who should honor Him and keep the knowledge of His will alive in the earth, He found only one man, Abraham, whom He could select as the father of His people. And when that people had become great and were being conducted to the land which God had given to them, they were told, "The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people, for ye were the fewest of all people." *Deuteronomy 7:7*. The majority of "the people" ignored God, and did as they pleased. Surely, if it were true that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," God would not have rejected the bulk of mankind for a comparatively insignificant race.*AMS November 1886, page 83.2*

Leaving out the great world who had rejected God, and had in consequence been rejected by Him, we find that "the people" whom God chose as His own peculiar people were, as a people, more often in opposition to God than in harmony with Him. It was "the people" who said to Aaron, "Make us gods, which shall go before us;" and when the golden calf was made, "the people" worshiped it. It was "the people" who said, "Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt;" and it was "the people" who time and again murmured against the Lord's chosen prophet, and were often on the point of stoning him to death.*AMS November 1886, page 83.3*

In the days when Christ was on earth, it was His own people to whom He came, who rejected Him. When He was accused before the Roman governor, it was "the people" of Israel-God's own chosen people-who cried, "Crucify Him!"*AMS November 1886, page 83.4*

Still later, when the disciples of Christ were many thousands in number in Jerusalem, they were still a poor, despised sect, and so few in number in comparison with "the people" who constituted the Church, that they were compelled to flee for their lives. Then Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And

he killed James with the sword; and when he saw that “the people” were pleased, he proceeded to take Peter also. This same Herod it was who a short time afterwards made an oration to a vast concourse who had assembled to do him honor, “And ‘the people’ gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man.” In this case “the voice of the people” was immediately shown to be not the voice of God for God rebuked their impiety, and caused the vile creature, whom they called a god, to die a loathsome death.*AMS November 1886, page 83.5*

Still later we find that “the people” whom God had taken out from among the Gentiles, became so great that they were deemed worthy of State recognition. In the great empire of Rome, which filled the world, the “Christians” were so numerous that the crafty and worldly-wise Constantine saw that it would be greatly to his advantage to favor them rather than his pagan subjects. So “the church” was “recognized” by the civil power. Thus the sect, which in the days of Paul was “everywhere spoken against,” now sat in the high places of the earth, and all nations were flowing unto it. See *Isaiah 2:3, 3*. Surely now the voice of the people must have been the voice of God, because Rome, which was then only a synonym for “the world,” was a “Christian nation.” This had not been brought about by a mere legal enactment without the concurrence of “the people,” but Christianity was exalted to the throne of the world because the majority so willed it. Constantine was too wise a ruler to make laws that would not receive the commendation of the majority of his subjects. The voice of the people was to him the voice of God, and when Christianity became the religion of the empire, it was simply the recognition of the prevailing sentiment.*AMS November 1886, page 83.6*

But was the voice of the people in that case really the voice of God? Far from it. This expression of the will of “the people”-the church-was only the last step but one in that great apostasy of which Paul had written (*2 Thessalonians 2:1-8*), and which culminated in the establishment of the Papacy, that “man of sin,” “the son of perdition,” who opposed and exalted himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he as God sat in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. This was the practical working of the adage, “The voice of the people is the voice of God.” The falsity

of that claim is shown by the fact that “the people’ who have impiously exalted themselves above God by claiming that their voice is His, are to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord’s mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of His coming.” *AMS November 1886, page 83.7*

In the brief description of the rise of the Papacy, the reader cannot fail to recognize the words which the “National Reformers” use to describe their movement. It is a significant fact that the same language which they use to describe what they are working for, most accurately describes the establishment of the Papacy, that professedly Christian power that persecuted Christians to the death. There is not a plea which the National Reformers use in behalf of their proposed Amendment to the Constitution, which will not apply exactly to the setting up of the Papacy. They say, This movement is wholly in the hands of the Christian Church; so was the great apostasy of the first three centuries. National Reformers say, We do not want an Amendment to the Constitution until it will be the natural outgrowth of the sentiment of the Christian people of the country; all Constantine and his successors did was to make laws voicing the sentiments of “the Christian people” of the empire. Say the “Reformers,” “The success of this movement will make the United States a Christian nation; that is what Rome became. Say they, *We will never persecute*; so said “Christian” Rome under similar circumstances, but time will in this case demonstrate the fact that like causes always produce like effects.” *AMS November 1886, page 83.8*

“Woe unto you, ... because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.” *Matthew 23:29-32. AMS November 1886, page 83.9*

And like effects bring like punishments. Let those who are inclined toward so-called “National Reform” take heed and beware.” *AMS November 1886, page 83.10*

